

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The above listing of claims amends each independent claim 1, 11, 13, 14, 29 and 39 to recite that the component of the consumer product is a three-dimensional component. Support for that change may be found in the application at page 12, lines 19-23; page 13, lines 31-33; and also at page 1, line 30 to page 2, line 10 (snap-on covers refer to a three-dimensional object); page 3, lines 11-16; page 6, lines 5-9, and page 7, lines 15-19 (molding and shaping refer to a three dimensional object). Claims 50-54 are added herein to recite that the three-dimensional component of the consumer product comprises a cover component of a mobile station. Support for these added claims derives at least from claims 25 and 26. Claim 41 was previously cancelled. Claims 1-40 and 42-54 are pending in the present application.

All independent claims prior to this RCE and amendment were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383 to Henson (hereinafter, Henson). As previously argued, Henson is directed to an online user interface by which a customer chooses computer options and orders a computer system that is built and shipped from a location remote from the user station. See, for example, Henson, col. 1, lines 18-21 (“build to order, for enabling configuration, pricing, and ordering of a computer system via the internet”). Henson specifically recites remote manufacturing, shipment times and shipping delays at col. 3, lines 30-33, col. 6, line 44 to col. 7, line 12, and the whole of Figure 9. The Examiner appeared to assert that a label, bar code, or sticker printed at a user station could constitute a component of the remotely-manufactured Henson computer. No reply was seen to the Applicant’s request in the Response dated April 9, 2004 for clarification of the above interpretation of the label, bar code, or sticker.

Claim 1, being exemplary of all independent claims in this aspect, recites “a manufacturing subsystem ... for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one three-dimensional component of said consumer product ...”. This is seen to distinguish over Henson’s build-to-order invention, and the three-dimensional aspect added herein by amendment is seen to further distinguish over the Examiner’s characterization of a locally printed label, bar code, or sticker.

Applicant strongly disagrees with the Examiner's apparent assertion that a user station that prints a label, bar code, or sticker that is later attached to a remotely-built Henson computer anticipates or makes obvious manufacturing a component of the computer at the user station. The changes made herein are not to be construed as an acquiescence to the Examiner's apparent assertion noted above. Applicant re-asserts each and every argument made in the responses dated October 2, 2003, and April 9, 2004, and reserves the right to pursue the original and/or other claims at a future date as authorized by statute. Based on the foregoing arguments, it is clear that the amendments made herein are not for reasons related to patentability, and the full range of equivalents for all elements of all claims remain available.

Applicant respectfully requests a favorable review and allowance of the pending claims without further delay. Applicant's undersigned representative invites the Examiner to discuss or clarify any concerns via teleconference where appropriate.

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald J. Stanton  
Reg. No.: 46,008

\_\_\_\_\_  
May 26, 2004  
Date

Customer No.: 29683  
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP                  Phone: (203) 925-9400  
4 Research Drive                  Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212                  Email: gstanton@hspatent.com

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

\_\_\_\_\_  
May 26, 2004  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Okrentowich